arXiv:1604.06975v2 [math.PR] 10 May 2016

THE SCALING LIMIT OF CRITICAL ISING INTERFACES IS CLE_3

STÉPHANE BENOIST AND CLÉMENT HONGLER

Abstract. In this paper, we consider the set of interfaces between + and − spins arising for the critical planar Ising model on a domain with + boundary conditions, and show that it converges towards CLE_3.

Our proof relies on the study of the coupling between the Ising model and its random cluster (FK) representation, and of the interactions between FK and Ising interfaces. The main idea is to construct an exploration process starting from the boundary of the domain, to discover the Ising loops and to establish its convergence to a conformally invariant limit. The challenge is that Ising loops do not touch the boundary; we use the fact that FK loops touch the boundary (and hence can be explored from the boundary) and that Ising loops in turn touch FK loops, to construct a recursive exploration process that visits all the macroscopic loops.

A key ingredient in the proof is the convergence of Ising free arcs to the Free Arc Ensemble (FAE), established in [BDH16]. Qualitative estimates about the Ising interfaces then allow one to identify the scaling limit of Ising loops as a conformally invariant collection of simple, disjoint SLE_3-like loops and thus by the Markovian characterization of [ShWe12] as a CLE_3.

A technical point of independent interest contained in this paper is an investigation of double points of interfaces in the scaling limit of critical FK-Ising. It relies on the technology of [KeSm12].

1. Introduction

1.1. **Schramm-Loewner Evolution.** The introduction of Schramm's SLE curves [Sch00] opened the road to decisive progress towards the understanding of 2D statistical mechanics. The $(SLE_\kappa)_{\kappa>0}$ form a one-parameter family of conformally invariant random curves that are the natural candidates for the scaling limits of interfaces found in critical lattice models, as shown by Schramm's principle [Sch00]: if a random curve is conformally invariant and satisfies the domain Markov property, then it must be an SLE_κ for some $\kappa > 0$. The convergence of lattice model curves to SLE has been established in a number of cases, in particular for the loop-erased random walk ($\kappa = 2$) and the uniform spanning tree ($\kappa = 8$) [LSW04], percolation ($\kappa = 6$) [Smi01], the Ising model ($\kappa = 3$) and FK-Ising ($\kappa = 16/3$) [CDHKS14], and the discrete Gaussian free field ($\kappa = 4$) [ScSh09].

The development of SLE has had rich ramifications, in particular the introduction of the Conformal Loop Ensembles (CLE) [She09]. The $(CLE_\kappa)_{\kappa\in(\frac{8}{3},8]}$ are conformally invariant collections of SLE_κ-like random loops; they conjecturally describe the full set (rather than a fixed marked set) of macroscopic interfaces appearing in discrete models. For percolation, the convergence of the full set of interfaces to CLE_6 has been established [CaNe07b]. For the Gaussian free field, the connection with CLE_4 is established in [MS16, ASW16]. For the random-cluster (FK) representation of the Ising model, the convergence of boundary-touching interfaces to a subset of $CLE_{16/3}$ has been established in [KeSm15]. This paper shows convergence of Ising interfaces to CLE_3, and this is the first convergence result in the non boundary touching regime $\kappa \leq 4$.

1.2. **Ising Interfaces and SLE.** The Ising model is the most classical model of equilibrium statistical mechanics. It consists of random configurations of ± 1 spins on the vertices of a graph $\mathcal{G}$, which interact with their neighbors: the probability of a spin configuration $(\sigma_x)_{x\in V}$ is proportional to $\exp(-\beta H(\sigma))$, where the energy $H(\sigma)$ is given by $-\sum_{x\sim y}\sigma_x\sigma_y$ and β is a positive parameter called the inverse temperature.

The two-dimensional Ising model (i.e. when $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathbb{Z}^2$) has been the subject of intense mathematical and physical investigations. A phase transition occurs at the critical value $\beta_c = \frac{1}{2}\ln\left(\sqrt{2}+1\right)$: for $\beta < \beta_c$ the spins are disordered at large distances, while for $\beta > \beta_c$ a long range order is present. Thanks to the exact solvability of the model, much is known about the phase transition of the model; the recent years have in particular seen important progress towards understanding

rigorously the scaling limit of the fields and the interfaces of the model at the critical temperature β_c.

For the two-dimensional Ising model, we call spin interfaces the curves that separate the + and − spins of the model. In the case of Dobrushin boundary conditions (i.e. + spins on a boundary arc and − spins on the boundary complement) the resulting distinguished spin interface linking boundary points can be shown to converge to SLE_3 [CDHKS14], using the discrete complex analysis of lattice fermions [Smi10a, ChSm12]. In the case of more general boundary conditions (in particular free ones), one obtains convergence to variants of SLE_3, as was established in [HoKy13, Izy15].

Another natural class of random curves are the interfaces of random-cluster representation of the model (which separate 'wired' from 'free' regions in the domain). Following the introduction of the fermionic observables [Smi10a], it was shown that the Dobrushin random-cluster interfaces converge to chordal $SLE_{16/3}$.

The study of more general collections of interfaces for the Ising model and its FK representation has seen recent progress. With free boundary conditions, the scaling limit of the interface arcs was obtained [BDH16]: by taking advantage of the fact that such arcs touch the boundary, an exploration tree is constructed, made of a bouncing and branching version of the dipolar SLE_3 process. For the FK model, an exploration tree is constructed in [KeSm15], and this tree allows one to represent the random-cluster loops that touch the boundary in terms of a branching $SLE_{16/3}$.

1.3. **Ising Model and CLE.** The purpose of this paper is to rigorously describe the full scaling limit of the Ising loops that arise in a domain with + boundary conditions:

Theorem 1. *Consider the critical Ising model on a discretization $(\Omega_\delta)_{\delta>0}$ of a (simply-connected) Jordan domain Ω, with + boundary conditions. Then the set of the interfaces between + and − spins converge in law to a nested* CLE_3 *as $\delta \to 0$, with respect to the metric $d_{\mathcal{X}}$ on the space of loop collections.*

The statement we prove is actually slightly stronger (Theorem 3 in Section 3.1). The precise definition of the Ising interfaces is given in Section 2.5, the CLE processes are introduced in Section 2.8 and the metric $d_{\mathcal{X}}$ is defined in Section 2.7.

Our strategy is to identify the scaling limit of these curves by using the coupling between the Ising model and its random-cluster (FK) representation, often called Edwards-Sokal coupling [Gri06]. This allows one to construct an exploration tree describing the Ising loops, by relying on the recursive application of a two-staged exploration:

- We first study the random-cluster interfaces by relying on the fact that they touch the boundary and hence can be described in terms of an exploration tree (as in [KeSm15], and similarly to [BDH16]).
- We then explore the Ising loops, which are contained inside the random-cluster loops: conditionally on the random-cluster loops, the Ising model inside has free boundary conditions, allowing one to use the result of [BDH16] to identify a subset of the Ising interfaces.
- At the end of the second stage, we obtain a number of a loops. Conditionally on these loops, the boundary conditions for Ising on the complement are monochromatic (either completely + or completely −), allowing one to re-iterate the exploration inside of those.

We then show that the conformally invariant interfaces that we have explored are simple and SLE_3-like. Together with the Markov property inherited from the lattice level, this allows one to use the uniqueness result of [ShWe12] to identify this limit as CLE_3.

1.4. **Outline of the Paper.**

- In Section 2, we give the definitions of the graphs, the models, the metrics and the loop ensembles.
- In Section 3, we give the precise statement of our main theorem, together with the main steps of the proof.
- In Section 4, we state two results about the scaling limit of Ising and FK interfaces that are instrumental in our proof, one borrowed from [BDH16], and the other one from the Appendix (related to [KeSm15]).

- In Section 5, we prove that the outermost Ising loops have a conformally invariant scaling limit.
- In Section 6, we identify the scaling limit of outermost Ising loops, and then construct the scaling limit of all Ising loops, thus concluding the proof of the main theorem.
- In the Appendix, we study the scaling limit of the FK loops, in particular proving its existence and conformal invariance, as well as showing that double points of discrete and continuous FK loops correspond to each other.

1.5. **Acknowledgements.** The authors would like to thank D. Chelkak, J. Dubédat, H. Duminil-Copin, K. Kytölä, P. Nolin, S. Sheffield, S. Smirnov and W. Werner for interesting and useful discussions. C.H. gratefully acknowledges the hospitality of the Courant Institute at NYU, where part of this work was completed, as well as support from the New York Academy of Sciences and the Blavatnik Family Foundation. C.H. is a member of the SwissMap Swiss NSF NCCR program.

2. Setup and Definitions

2.1. **Graphs.** We consider the usual square grid $\mathbb{Z}^2$, with the usual adjacency relation (denoted $\sim$). We denote by $\left(\mathbb{Z}^2\right)^*$ the dual graph, by $(\mathbb{Z}^2)^m$ the medial graph (whose vertices are the centers of edges of $\mathbb{Z}^2$; two vertices of $(\mathbb{Z}^2)^m$ are adjacent if the corresponding edges of $\mathbb{Z}^2$ share a vertex) and by $(\mathbb{Z}^2)^b$ the bi-medial graph (i.e. the medial graph of $(\mathbb{Z}^2)^m$). Note that $(\mathbb{Z}^2)^b$ has a natural embedding in the plane as $\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}^2+(\frac{1}{4},\frac{1}{4})$. We will consider *discrete domains* of $\mathbb{Z}^2$, made of a simply-connected finite union of faces of $\mathbb{Z}^2$. For a discrete domain $\mathcal{G}$, we denote by $\mathcal{G}^*$ the dual of $\mathcal{G}$, by $\mathcal{G}^m$ the medial of $\mathcal{G}$ and by $\mathcal{G}^b$ the bi-medial of $\mathcal{G}$. We denote by $\partial\mathcal{G}\subset\mathcal{G}$ the (inner) boundary of $\mathcal{G}$, which we either see as the set of vertices of $\mathcal{G}$ adjacent to $\mathbb{Z}^2\setminus\mathcal{G}$, or as the circuit of edges separating the faces of $\mathcal{G}$ from those of $\mathbb{Z}^2\setminus\mathcal{G}$.

Consider a (continuous) Jordan domain $\Omega\subset\mathbb{C}$, i.e. such that $\partial\Omega$ is a simple curve. We call *discretization* of Ω a family $(\Omega_\delta)_\delta$ of discrete domains of $\delta\mathbb{Z}^2$ (the square grid of mesh size $\delta>0$) such that $\partial\Omega_\delta\to\partial\Omega$ (where we identify $\partial\Omega_\delta$ with its edge circuit) as $\delta\to 0$ in the topology of uniform convergence up to reparametrization.

2.2. **Ising Model.** The Ising model on a graph $\mathcal{G}$ at inverse temperature $\beta>0$ consists of random configurations $(\sigma_x)_{x\in\mathcal{G}}$ of ±1 spins with probability proportional to $\exp\left(-\beta H\left(\sigma\right)\right)$ where the energy H is given by $-H\left(\sigma\right)=\sum_{x\sim y}\sigma_x\sigma_y$ (the sum is over all pair of adjacent spins of $\mathcal{G}$). We will focus on the Ising model at the critical temperature, i.e. with $\beta=\beta_c$. If there are no particular conditions on the spins of $\partial\mathcal{G}$ we speak of *free boundary conditions*, if the spins of $\partial\mathcal{G}$ are conditioned to be $+1$ (resp. -1), we speak of $+$ *boundary conditions* (resp. $-$ *boundary conditions*).

2.3. **FK model.** The *Fortuin-Kasteleyn (FK) model* (see [Gri06] for a reference) on a discrete domain $\mathcal{G}$ is a (dependent) bond percolation model, which assigns a random *open* or *closed* state to the edges of $\mathcal{G}$. A *configuration* consists of the set of the open edges of $\mathcal{G}$. The $\mathrm{FK}\left(p,q\right)$ model assigns to a configuration ω a probability proportional to $p^{\mathbf{o}(\omega)}\left(1-p\right)^{\mathbf{c}(\omega)}q^{\mathbf{k}(\omega)}$, where $\mathbf{o}\left(\omega\right)$ is the number of open edges, $\mathbf{c}\left(\omega\right)$ the number of closed edges and $\mathbf{k}\left(\omega\right)$ the number of clusters (connected components) of vertices of $\mathcal{G}$ linked by open edges. We speak of *free boundary conditions* if there are no particular conditions and of *wired boundary conditions* if the boundary edges are conditioned to be open (i.e. the edges between vertices of $\partial\mathcal{G}$ are open).

An important feature of the two-dimensional FK model is *duality*. For an FK configuration ω on a discrete domain $\mathcal{G}$, we define the *dual configuration* ω^* on $\mathcal{G}^*$ whose open edges are the dual to the closed edges of ω and vice versa. It can be shown that for $p\left(1-p\right)^{-1}p^*\left(1-p^*\right)^{-1}=q$, the dual of an $\mathrm{FK}\left(p,q\right)$ configuration on $\mathcal{G}$ with wired boundary conditions is an $\mathrm{FK}\left(p^*,q\right)$ configuration on $\mathcal{G}^*$ with free boundary conditions. The *self-dual* (or critical) FK model corresponds to $\mathrm{FK}\left(p_{\mathrm{sd}},q\right)$, where the self-dual value $p_{\mathrm{sd}}=\frac{\sqrt{q}}{1+\sqrt{q}}$ is such that $p_{\mathrm{sd}}^*=p_{\mathrm{sd}}$.

2.4. **FK-Ising Model.** When $q=2$, the FK model is called the *FK-Ising model*. The Ising model at inverse temperature β can be sampled from the FK-Ising model with $p=1-e^{-2\beta}$ by performing percolation on the FK clusters, see e.g. [Gri06]: for each FK cluster we toss a balanced coin and assign the same ±1 spin value to all the vertices of the cluster, and do this independently for each

cluster. The self-dual FK-Ising model with $p_{\text{sd}} = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{1+\sqrt{2}}$ corresponds to the critical Ising model. In this paper, the only FK model we will work with is the self-dual FK-Ising model. In order to clearly distinguish it from the Ising model, we will often refer to the self-dual FK-Ising model as just the FK model.

2.5. **Ising Loops.** A sequence of vertices $v_1, \dots, v_n$ is called a *strong path* if $v_i \sim v_{i+1}$ for $1 \leq i < n$ (where $\sim$ denotes the adjacency relation) and a *weak path* if v_i is weakly adjacent to v_{i+1} (i.e. v_i and v_{i+1} share an edge or a face) for $1 \leq i < n$.

Consider the Ising model on a discrete domain $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathbb{Z}^2$. An *Ising loop* is an oriented simple loop on $\mathcal{G}^*$ (i.e. a closed path of edges of $\mathcal{G}^*$ such that no edge is used twice) and such that any edge of the loop has a $+$ spin on its left and a $-$ spin on its right. In other words, an Ising loop separates a weak path of $+$ spins and a weak path of $-$ spins, and is hence clockwise-oriented if it has $+$ spins outside and $-$ spins inside (and counter-clockwise oriented otherwise). An Ising loop is called *leftmost* if it follows a strong path of $+$ on its left side, and *rightmost* if it follows a strong path of $-$ spins on its right.

In a domain carrying $+$ boundary conditions, an Ising loop is called *outermost* if it is not strictly contained inside another Ising loop, i.e. if it is not separated from the boundary by a a closed weak path of $-$ spins. Let us now define the *level* of an Ising loop (in a domain with $+$ boundary conditions). An Ising loop is said to be of level 1, if it is outermost, of level $2k$ for $k \geq 1$ if it is contained inside an Ising loop of level $2k-1$ and if it is not separated by a weak path of $+$ spins from that loop, and of level $2k+1$ for $k \geq 1$ if it is contained inside of an Ising loop of level $2k$ and if it is not separated by a weak path of $-$ spins from that loop.

2.6. **FK Loops and Cut-Out Domains.** Given an FK configuration, the set of FK interfaces forms a set of loop on $\mathcal{G}^b$ A bi-medial edge is part of an FK interface if it lays between a primal FK cluster and a dual FK cluster, i.e. if it does not cross a primal open edge or a dual open edge. With wired or free boundary conditions, it is easy to see that the set of bi-medial edges that are part of an FK interface forms a collection of nested loops.

The level of an FK loop is defined by declaring a loop of level 1 or outermost if it is not contained inside another FK loop, and of level $k > 1$ if it is contained inside a loop of level $k-1$ and outermost within that loop.

We call a component of the interior of an outermost FK loop a *cut-out domain*. This notion will be crucial for us in the scaling limit. The set of FK loops satisfy the following spatial Markov property [Gri06]: consider the FK model with wired boundary conditions, conditionally on the outermost FK loops, the model inside the cut-out domains consists of independent FK models with free (resp. wired) boundary conditions.

Remark 2. In the coupling with FK, the Ising loops are always a subset of the dual FK configuration. In particular Ising loops and FK loops never cross. As a consequence, Ising loops are contained in cut-out domains.

2.7. **Topology on the Space of Loop Collections.** Consider the metric d_Γ on the space of oriented loops defined as the supremum norm up to reparametrization: $d_\Gamma(\gamma, \tilde{\gamma}) = \inf \|\gamma - \tilde{\gamma}\|_\infty$, where the infimum is taken over all orientation-respecting parametrizations of the loops γ and $\tilde{\gamma}$. We define the space Γ to be the completion of the set of simple oriented loops for the metric d_Γ: Γ is the set of oriented non-self-crossing loops (including trivial loops reduced to points).

The space $\mathcal{X}$ of loop collections is the space of at most countable subsets $\{\gamma_i\}_{i \in I} \subset \Gamma$ (including the empty set) such that

- For each $i \in I$, the loop γ_i is not reduced to a point.
- For each compact set $\mathcal{K} \subset \Gamma$ of the set of loops, the set of indices $\{i \in I : \gamma_i \in \mathcal{K}\}$ is finite.

We equip the space $\mathcal{X}$ with the following metric:

$$d_{\mathcal{X}}\left(\{\gamma_i\}_{i\in I}, \{\gamma_j\}_{j\in J}\right) = \inf_{\pi:\text{matchings}(I,J)} \max\left(\sup_{(i,j)\in\pi} d_\Gamma(\gamma_i, \gamma_j), \sup_{k\in K} \text{diam}(\gamma_k)\right),$$



FIGURE 2.1. Ising and FK loops. Plain black lines represent the domain $\mathcal{G}$, dashed lines represent $\mathcal{G}^*$ and dotted lines represent $\mathcal{G}^b$. In red and blue, the primal FK configuration ω ($k(\omega) = 7$), red corresponding to FK connected components carrying $+$ Ising spins, and blue to FK components carrying $-$ spins. The two shades of green represent the dual FK configuration, with light green being the subset traced by Ising loops. In orange, the set of FK loops.

where the infimum is taken over all (partial) matchings $\pi = \{(i,j)\}$ of the sets I and J, where K denotes the set of indices of $I \cup J$ that not matched by π, and where diam denotes the Euclidean diameter.

The space $\mathcal{X}$ is complete and separable: it is hence Polish, and we work with its Borel σ-algebra. Note that the following events on $\mathcal{X}$ are measurable:

- The collection $(\gamma_i)_{i\in I}$ consists of non-crossing non-nested loops (these collections actually form a closed set in $\mathcal{X}$).
- The loops of the collection $(\gamma_i)_{i\in I}$ are disjoint.
- All the loops of $(\gamma_i)_{i\in I}$ are simple.

2.8. **Conformal Loop Ensembles.** The CLE measures have been introduced in [She09] as the natural candidates to describe conformally invariant collections of loops arising as scaling limits of statistical mechanics interfaces. They form a family indexed by $\kappa \in (\frac{8}{3}, 8]$ of random collections of SLE_κ-like loops.

The (usual) CLE_κ measure is defined on a planar simply-connected domain and consists of a collection of non-nested loops. For $\kappa \in (\frac{8}{3}, 4]$, the (usual) CLE_κ have an elegant loop-soup construction [ShWe12]: the CLE_κ loops can be constructed by taking the boundaries of clusters of loops in a Brownian loop soup of intensity $c = (3\kappa - 8)(6 - \kappa)/2\kappa$.

For a nested collection of continuous loops, we define the *level* of a loop as follows: the outermost loops have level 1, the outermost loops within the level 1 loops are level 2, etc. The *nested* CLE_κ is iteratively constructed as follows: its loops of level 1 are the loops of a usual CLE_κ, and its loops of level $k > 1$ are obtained by sampling independent (usual) CLE_κ inside each loop of level

$k-1$. We choose to orient CLE loops according to their level: clockwise for odd level loops, and counterclockwise for even level loops.

2.9. **CLE Markovian Characterization.** An important result on CLE is its Markovian characterization.

Theorem ([ShWe12]). *A family of measures μ_Ω on non-nested collections of simple loops defined on simply-connected domains Ω is the (usual)* CLE_κ *for a certain $\kappa \in (\frac{8}{3}, 4]$ if and only if the following holds with probability* 1*:*

- *The collection is locally finite: for any $\epsilon > 0$ and any bounded region $K \subseteq \Omega$, there are only finitely-many loops of diameter greater than ϵ in K.*
- *Distinct loops of the collection are disjoint.*
- *The family is conformally invariant: for any conformal mapping $\varphi : \Omega \to \varphi(\Omega)$, we have $\varphi_* \mu_\Omega = \mu_{\varphi(\Omega)}$.*
- *The family satisfies the* Markovian restriction property *on any simply-connected domain Ω: for any compact set $K \subset \Omega$ such that $\Omega \setminus K$ is simply-connected, if $\{\gamma_i\}_{i\in I}$ is sampled from μ_Ω, setting $I_K := \{i : \gamma_i \cap K \neq \emptyset\}$ we have that $\{\gamma_i\}_{i\in I}$ conditioned on $\{\gamma_i\}_{i\in I_K}$ has the law of $\mu_{\Omega\setminus\mathcal{L}_K}$, where $\mu_{\Omega\setminus\mathcal{L}_K}$ is defined as the independent product of $\mu_{\Omega'}$ taken over all connected components Ω' of $\Omega \setminus \mathcal{L}_K$ and where $\mathcal{L}_K = K \cup \{\mathrm{Inside}(\gamma_i) \cup \gamma_i : i \in I_K\}$.*

3. Main Theorem

3.1. **Statement and Strategy.** Let us now give the precise version of our main result:

Theorem 3. *Consider the critical Ising model with + boundary conditions on a discretization $(\Omega_\delta)_{\delta>0}$ of a Jordan domain Ω,. Then as the mesh size $\delta \to 0$, the set of all leftmost Ising loops converges in law with respect to $d_{\mathcal{X}}$ to the nested* CLE_3*.*

Furthermore, with high probability, any macroscopic Ising loop ℓ is close to a leftmost loop ℓ_L in the following sense. For any $\epsilon > 0$, with probability tending to 1 as $\delta \to 0$, for any loop ℓ of diameter larger than ϵ there exists a leftmost loop ℓ_L such that the connected components of $(\ell \cup \ell_L) \setminus (\ell \cap \ell_L)$ have diameter less than ϵ.

Remark 4. The same result holds for rightmost loops, as the proof will show.

The strategy for the proof is the following:

- We first prove that the collection of level one (i.e. outermost) Ising loops has a conformally invariant scaling limit (Section 5).
- We then show that this limit consists of loops that are simple, do not touch the boundary or each other, and satisfy the Markovian restriction property (Section 6.1).
- We then use the characterization of CLE to identify the scaling limit of the outermost loops as non-nested CLE_3 and finally obtain the convergence of all Ising loops to nested CLE_3 (Section 6.2).

Remark 5. In [MSW16], the authors explain how CLE_3 can be obtained, directly in the continuum, by performing percolation on the $\mathrm{CLE}_{16/3}$ clusters (by analogy with the FK and Ising coupling). This approach explains how the joint coupling works in the continuous and provide a proof scheme for the joint convergence of Ising and FK loops towards a coupling of $\mathrm{CLE}_{16/3}$ and CLE_3 (our approach does not, as we keep resampling the coupled FK model to further explore Ising loops). Remark 17 provides some of the technical tools needed for this joint convergence, but some further study of the set of discrete FK loops seems needed in order to get a complete argument.

4. Scaling Limits of Ising and FK Interfaces

In this section, we state two results on which our proof relies: first, the identification of the scaling limit of the free boundary conditions arc for the Ising model and second, the conformal invariance of the scaling limit of the FK interface loops.



(A) The Ising loops to explore (colors for Ising loops: level 1 in purple, level 2 in orange)



(B) Ising loops and the coupled FK (colors for FK loops: level 1 in red, level 2 in blue, level 3 in brown)



(C) We first consider all FK loops of level 1



(D) Then, we find all Ising loops (of level 1) that touch the explored FK loops



(E) We resample the FK loops (in green) in the domains bounded by the Ising loops we have found



(F) We find all Ising loops (of level 1 and 2) that touch the resampled outermost FK loops



(G) All the loops used in the exploration process

FIGURE 3.1. The exploration scheme

4.1. **Ising Free Arc Ensembles.** The first result that we need is the identification of the scaling limit of the Ising arcs that arise with free boundary conditions. For the Ising model on a discrete domain $\mathcal{G}$ with free boundary conditions, we call an *Ising arc* a spin interface that links two boundary points. In the continuous, we refer to the set of arcs produced by a branching $\mathrm{SLE}_3(-\frac{3}{2},-\frac{3}{2})$ as the Free Arc Ensemble (FAE) [BDH16].

Theorem 6 ([BDH16, Theorem 6])**.** *Consider the critical Ising model on a discretization $(\Omega_\delta)_{\delta>0}$ of a Jordan domain Ω, with free boundary conditions. Then as $\delta \to 0$, the set of all Ising arcs converges in law to the Free Arc Ensemble (for the Hausdorff metric on sets of curves, where curves are equipped with the topology of uniform convergence up to reparametrization).*

As explained in [BDH16], the scaling limits of the interfaces linking pairs of boundary points (and bouncing on the boundary when needed) can be deterministically recovered by gluing the FAE arcs. These two sets of curves (the arcs on the one hand and the scaling limit of the interfaces between boundary points on the other hand) contain the same data in the continuous.

4.2. **Conformal Invariance of FK-Ising Interfaces and Cut-Out Domains.** For the proof of our main theorem, we need the following result, which is closely related to (but independent of) the result of Kemppainen and Smirnov about the scaling limit of the boundary-touching FK loops in smooth domains [KeSm15]. This result includes in particular the convergence of FK cut-out domains to *continuous cut-out domains*, defined as the maximal domains contained inside the scaling limit of FK loops.

Proposition 7. *Consider the critical FK-Ising loops on a discretization $(\Omega_\delta)_\delta$ of a Jordan domain Ω, with wired boundary conditions. The FK loops have a conformally invariant scaling limit as the mesh size $\delta \to 0$. Furthermore the discrete cut-out domains converge to the continuous cut-out domains.*

Proof. The first part is proven as Proposition 16 in the Appendix and the second part follows from Remark 17 just after. □

5. Scaling Limit of Ising Outermost Loops

Let us now argue that the outermost Ising loops have a conformally invariant scaling limit. Consider the critical Ising model with + boundary conditions coupled with an FK model with wired boundary conditions on a discretization $(\Omega_\delta)_{\delta>0}$ of a Jordan domain Ω.

Lemma 8. *As the mesh size $\delta \to 0$, the leftmost level one Ising loops converge in law with respect to the topology generated by $d_{\mathcal{X}}$ to a conformally invariant scaling limit.*

Furthermore, the Ising loops in the scaling limit are contained in the continuous cut-out domains.

Proof. Recall that the Ising loops are contained inside of the cut-out domains of the coupled FK model (Remark 2). We start by exploring the outermost FK loops. Let us denote by $\mathcal{C}(\Omega_\delta)$ the set of associated discrete cut-out domains in Ω_δ. Each $C_\delta \in \mathcal{C}(\Omega_\delta)$ is bordered on its outside by a strong path of + and, conditionally on C_δ, the Ising spins inside of C_δ have free boundary conditions. For any cut-out domain C_δ, we can construct the set $\mathcal{L}(C_\delta)$ of all leftmost Ising loops that touch the boundary of C_δ by gluing Ising arcs in C_δ. More precisely, for any point $z \in C_\delta$ and any point b on the boundary of C_δ, consider the arc $a(z,b)$ closest to z among the set of all leftmost Ising arcs disconnecting z from b. Let $\mathcal{A}(z)$ be the collection of all the arcs $a(z,b)$ when b runs over the whole boundary of C_δ. Either all arcs in $\mathcal{A}(z)$ carry − spins on the side of z, and then their collection forms a leftmost Ising loop of $\mathcal{L}(C_\delta)$. Or these arcs all carry + spins on the side of z, and then z is not surrounded by a loop of $\mathcal{L}(C_\delta)$. Note that all the loops in the collection $\mathcal{L}(C_\delta)$ are outermost, as they are connected by a strong + path to the boundary.

Now, for a cut-out domain $C_\delta \in \mathcal{C}(\Omega_\delta)$, we have that the loops of $\mathcal{L}(C_\delta)$ further cut C_δ in regions of two types:

- The regions enclosed by the loops of $\mathcal{L}(C_\delta)$ (each loop $L_\delta \in \mathcal{L}(C_\delta)$ separates an inner weak circuit of − on its inside and a strong circuit of + on its outside)
- The regions $R_\delta \in \mathcal{R}(C_\delta)$ that are outside the loops of $\mathcal{L}(C_\delta)$ (these regions have strong + boundary conditions).

For any Ising loop ℓ_δ inside of $\mathcal{C}(\Omega_\delta)$, we have three possibilities:

- The loop ℓ_δ is strictly contained inside of a loop of $\mathcal{L}(C_\delta)$: in this case, it is of level two or higher (i.e. it is not outermost).
- The loop ℓ_δ is contained inside of a loop $L_\delta \in \mathcal{L}(C_\delta)$ and it shares an edge with L_δ (and hence is of level one, but not leftmost if it is distinct from L_δ). The structure of these loops is described in Lemma 9 below.
- The loop ℓ_δ is strictly contained in a region $R_\delta \in \mathcal{R}(C_\delta)$ outside the loops of $\mathcal{L}(C_\delta)$.

In order to find all the leftmost level 1 Ising loops we hence just need to explore the regions $R_\delta \in \mathcal{R}(C_\delta)$. Since any such region has + boundary conditions, we can re-iterate the exploration that we use for Ω_δ: we represent the Ising model on R_δ using (a resampled) FK representation with wired boundary conditions, explore the outermost FK loops, and construct Ising loops in a cut-out domain $C'_\delta \in \mathcal{C}(R_\delta)$ by gluing arcs of the FAE in $C'_\delta \in \mathcal{C}(R_\delta)$. The outermost loops that we find in R_δ are also outermost in Ω_δ. Moreover, any level 1 leftmost loop in R_δ that has not been discovered at this stage is contained in a further subregion $R'_\delta \in \mathcal{R}(C'_\delta)$, outside of the loops of $\mathcal{L}(C'_\delta)$.

Iterating the procedure, we obtain smaller and smaller regions that are yet to be explored. For any $\epsilon > 0$, with high probability after enough iterations, all the regions that remain to be explored are all of diameter less than ϵ.

By Proposition 7 the FK loops have a conformally invariant scaling limit. Furthermore, the discrete cut-out domains converge to the continuous cut-out domains as $\delta \to 0$. Now, for any cut-out domain C_δ, the Ising arc ensemble in C_δ converges to the (conformally invariant) Free Arc Ensemble in C (Theorem 6) as $\delta \to 0$. This allows one to describe the scaling limit of all the outermost Ising loops, by following the exploration procedure described above. □

Lemma 9. *Any macroscopic level one Ising loop is close to a leftmost level one loop, as in Theorem 3. Moreover the set of rightmost level one loops has the same scaling limit as the set of leftmost loops.*

Proof. This is a direct consequence of [BDH16, Section 4.2] (see Lemma 18 and the argument following it). It is indeed proven there that leftmost and rightmost Ising arcs are close to each other, in the sense that the macroscopic leftmost and rightmost interfaces can be paired so that the symmetric difference of the pair is made of connected components of small diameter. As leftmost and rightmost Ising loops are constructed by gluing leftmost and rightmost Ising arcs respectively, the same claim follows for loops. Moreover, any macroscopic loop sharing an edge with a leftmost loop has to stay in the region delimited by the leftmost/rightmost pair, and in particular its symmetric difference with the leftmost loop is also made of connected components of small diameter. □

6. Identification of the Scaling Limit

6.1. **Qualitative Properties of the Scaling Limit of Ising Loops.** In this section, we prove Theorem 3. Let us first argue that the scaling limit of an Ising loop 'locally looks' like SLE_3:

Lemma 10. *Consider the scaling limit of the outermost Ising loops. There is a subarc of at least one loop that looks like* SLE_3.

Proof. As explained in the proof of Lemma 8, the Ising loops can be constructed by gluing arcs of the FAE, which are pieces of an $SLE_3\left(-\frac{3}{2},-\frac{3}{2}\right)$ exploration tree. As a result, Ising loops have subarcs that look like SLE_3 (e.g. they have Hausdorff dimension $11/8$, see [Bef08]). □

Consider the critical Ising model with + boundary conditions on the discretization Ω_δ of a Jordan domain Ω. For any boundary subarc $\mathcal{I} \subset \partial\Omega$, and any positive real $r > 0$, let $\mathcal{I}^r := \{z \in \Omega : \mathrm{d}(z, \mathcal{I}) \leq r\}$ be the r-neighborhood of $\mathcal{I}$. For any positive reals $\epsilon > \eta > 0$, let $E_\delta(\eta, \epsilon, \mathcal{I})$ be the event that there is a weak $-$ spin cluster linking $\mathcal{I}^\eta$ to $\Omega \setminus \mathcal{I}^\epsilon$.

Lemma 11. *For any $\epsilon > 0$, we have*

$$\lim_{\eta \to 0} \limsup_{\delta \to 0} \mathbb{P}\left(E_\delta(\eta, \epsilon, \partial\Omega)\right) = 0. \tag{6.1}$$

In particular, in the scaling limit, the outermost Ising loops almost surely do not touch the boundary.

Proof. Let us suppose by contradiction that this limit is positive: as we will see that this will imply the occurrence of a zero-probability event for SLE_3. If (6.1) were not to hold, we could find some $\epsilon > 0$ and some strict boundary subarc $\mathcal{I} \subset \partial\Omega$ such that

$$\limsup_{\eta\to 0} \limsup_{\delta\to 0} \mathbb{P}\left(E_\delta\left(\eta, \epsilon, \mathcal{I}\right)\right) = \alpha > 0.$$

Let us consider a proper sub-arc $\mathcal{J} \subset \partial\Omega \setminus \mathcal{I}$ and consider the critical Ising model on Ω_δ with $+$ boundary conditions on $\partial\Omega\setminus\mathcal{J}$ and $-$ boundary conditions on $\mathcal{J}$ (denote by $\mathbb{P}^{+/-}$ the corresponding measure). By monotonicity with respect to the boundary conditions, we would have

$$\limsup_{\eta\to 0} \limsup_{\delta\to 0} \mathbb{P}^{+/-}\left(E_\delta\left(\eta, \epsilon, \mathcal{I}\right)\right) = \alpha^{'} \geq \alpha > 0.$$

Let us fix sequences $\eta_k \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$ and $\delta_{n,k} \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$ such that for all n, k we have

$$\mathbb{P}^{+/-}\left(E_{\delta_{n,k}}\left(\eta_k, \epsilon, \mathcal{I}\right)\right) \geq \frac{\alpha'}{2} > 0.$$

Let us condition on the first crossing ξ of $-$ spins from $\mathcal{I}^\eta$ to $\Omega \setminus \partial^\epsilon\Omega$ in counterclockwise order (say). By RSW-type estimates [CDH16, Corollary 1.7], we obtain that with (uniformly) positive probability, ξ is connected by a path of $-$ spins to the $-$ spins of $\mathcal{J}$. This implies that the Ising interface generated by the $\pm$ boundary condition hits $\mathcal{I}^{\eta_k}$. Passing to the limit $n \to \infty$ and then $k \to \infty$ implies that the scaling limit of the interface generated by the boundary conditions hits $\mathcal{I}$ with positive probability, which is a contradiction: the scaling limit is SLE_3 [CDHKS14, Theorem 1], which never hits the boundary of the domain it lives in [Law05]. □

Lemma 12. *The scaling limit of the outermost Ising loops are almost surely simple and do not touch each other.*

Proof. As explained in the proof of Lemma 8, the outermost Ising loops are 'harvested' through the iteration of a two-step exploration process of FK loops and Ising arcs. Let us call the *harvest time* of an outermost Ising loop the number of iterations needed to discover it. Two Ising loops with different harvest time do not touch each other in the scaling limit. Indeed, the loops that are harvested at a given time $T > 1$ are recovered as outermost loops within cut-out domains containing an Ising configuration with $+$ boundary conditions. By Lemma 11, these boundary conditions separate the Ising loops harvested at time T from the loops that were harvested at earlier times.

We now show that the loops harvested at a fixed time T are almost surely simple and do not touch each other. All Ising loops are recovered by gluing arcs of a FAE staying in a cut-out domain of some FK loops. By Proposition 18, the boundaries of cut-out domains are simple disjoint curves. Moreover, the Ising loops that stay within a single cut-out domain are simple and disjoint: indeed, these loops are constructed by gluing arcs of the FAE, which is a family of simple disjoint arcs. □

Lemma 13. *The scaling limits of the outermost Ising loops satisfy the domain Markov property.*

Proof. This directly follows from the discrete Markov property, together with the convergence of outermost Ising loops for any discrete approximation of the continuous domain (Lemma 8). □

6.2. **Proof of Theorem 3.**

Proof. The outermost Ising loops have a conformally invariant scaling limit (Lemma 8). By Lemmas 11 and 12, the loops of the scaling limit are simple and do not touch each other or the boundary. By Lemma 13, these loops satisfy the Markovian restriction property. Hence, by the Sheffield-Werner Markovian characterization property, the scaling limit of the outermost Ising loops is a CLE_κ for some $\frac{8}{3} < \kappa \leq 4$. By Lemma 10 and the construction of CLE_κ in terms of SLE_κ-like loops [She09], we deduce that κ must be equal to 3.

We now establish the convergence of the Ising loops of level 2. These loops lay inside of the outermost Ising loops, i.e. are loops of an Ising configuration with $-$ boundary conditions. The set of leftmost loops in a domain with $-$ boundary conditions has the same law as the set of rightmost loops in a domain with $+$ boundary conditions. By the second part of Lemma 9, the scaling limit of level 2 loops is hence given by independent CLE_3 in each of the level 1 loops. Further iterating

this argument, we identify the set of loops of level n as independent CLE_3 inside the loops of level $n-1$, and thus obtain the convergence of the set of all Ising loops to nested CLE_3. □

Appendix A. FK interfaces have a conformally invariant scaling limit

In this section, we prove Proposition 7: we show that for any Jordan domain Ω, the set of all level one (outermost) FK loops in Ω converges towards a conformally invariant limit (see also [KeSm15] for an alternative approach). We prove the convergence of a single FK exploration path (Lemma 14) without smoothness assumptions on $\partial\Omega$.

We rely on [KeSm12] to get tightness of the exploration path, and we rely on the convergence result [CDHKS14, Theorem 2] together with an argument similar to the one used in [BDH16] to identify the scaling limit. Once we know the convergence of a single exploration, we can deduce the convergence of all outermost FK loops by iteratively using the convergence of FK exploration interfaces (Proposition 16).

A.1. **Convergence of FK interfaces.** Consider a discrete domain Ω_δ, with dual Ω_δ^* and bi-medial Ω_δ^b. Consider an FK model configuration ω on Ω_δ with wired boundary conditions and its dual configuration ω^*. Given boundary bi-medial points a and b, we define the *FK exploration γ_δ of ω from a to b* as follows:

- γ_δ is a simple path on the bi-medial graph of Ω_δ from a to b
- when γ_δ is not on the boundary $\partial\Omega_\delta^b$, γ_δ follows the primal boundary cluster of ω on its left and a dual cluster of ω^* on its right
- when γ_δ is on $\partial\Omega_\delta^b$, γ_δ keeps a dual cluster on its right whenever possible (i.e. with the constraint that γ_δ is simple and goes from a to b).

Lemma 14. *Let Ω_δ be a discrete approximation of a Jordan domain Ω and let $a_\delta, b_\delta \in \partial\Omega_\delta^b$ with $a_\delta, b_\delta \to a, b \in \partial\Omega$. Let γ_δ be the FK exploration from a_δ to b_δ. Then γ_δ converges in law to an $SLE_{16/3}(-2/3)$ curve, with respect to the supremum norm up to reparametrization.*

Proof. For any discrete time step $n \geq 0$, let us denote by $\Omega_{n,\delta}$ the connected component of $\Omega_\delta \setminus \gamma_\delta[0,n]$ containing b. Let us denote by $O_{n,\delta}$ the clockwise-most point of $\partial\Omega_{n,\delta} \cap \partial\Omega_\delta$ (i.e. the rightmost intersection of $\gamma_\delta[0,n]$ with $\partial\Omega_\delta$). Conditionally on $\gamma_\delta[0,n]$, the configuration ω in $\Omega_{n,\delta}$ is an FK configuration with boundary conditions that are free on the right of γ_δ (i.e. on the counterclockwise arc $[\gamma_\delta(n), O_{n,\delta}]$) and wired elsewhere.

Analogously to the reasoning made in [BDH16], we can use the crossing estimates of [CDH16] on the domains $(\Omega_{n,\delta})$ to apply the technology of [KeSm12, Theorems 3.4 and 3.12] which allows us to obtain that the law of the exploration γ_δ is tight.

Let us now consider an almost sure scaling limit γ of γ_{δ_k} for $\delta_k \to 0$ (which is possible via the Skorokhod embedding theorem). Consider a conformal mapping $\Omega \to \mathbb{H}$ with $a, b \mapsto 0, \infty$ and denote by λ the image of γ. Encode λ by a Loewner chain, i.e. consider the family of conformal mappings $g_t : H_t \to \mathbb{H}$, where H_t is the unbounded connected component of $\mathbb{H} \setminus \lambda[0,t]$ and we normalize t and g_t such that, for any time t, $g_t(z) = z + 2t/z + o(1/z)$ as $z \to \infty$. Set $U_t := g_t(\lambda(t))$ and $O_t := \sup(\lambda[0,t] \cap \mathbb{R})$. As usual, we have the Loewner equation $\partial_t g_t(z) = 2/(g_t(z) - U_t)$ and as a result $(U_t)_t$ characterizes λ and hence γ.

Let us now characterize the law of U_t.

Set $X_t := (O_t - U_t)/\sqrt{\kappa}$. The following two properties allow one to prove that $(X_t)_t$ is a Bessel process of dimension $d = 3/2$ (as in [BDH16]):

- The process $(X_t)_t$ is instantaneously reflecting off 0, i.e the set of times $\{t : X_t = 0\}$ has zero Lebesgue measure: this is a deterministic property for Loewner chains (see e.g. [MS16, Lemma 2.5]). This imply that $(X_t)_t$ can be deterministically recovered from the ordered set of its excursions away from 0.
- When $(X_t)_t$ is away from 0, the tip of the curve $\gamma(t)$ is away from the boundary arc $[a,b]$. This corresponds in the discrete to a time t when the curve $\gamma_{\delta_k}(t)$ is away from the boundary arc $[a_{\delta_k}, b_{\delta_k}]$, and hence the domain yet to be explored Ω_{t,δ_k} has 'macroscopic Dobrushin conditions' in the sense that both the wired and free boundary arcs are macroscopic. By [CDHKS14, Theorem 2], the curve λ behaves as chordal SLE $(16/3)$ headed towards O_t until

the first hitting time of $[O_t, +\infty)$, which is the same, by SLE coordinate change [ScWi05], as an $SLE_{16/3}(-2/3)$ with force point at O_t until the first hitting time of $[O_t, +\infty)$. Hence, the law of the ordered set of excursions of $(X_t)_t$ away from 0 is that of the ordered set of excursions of a Bessel process of dimension $d = 3/2$ away from 0.

Let us now identify the process O_t. By integrating the Loewner equation, we find that $O_t = \int \frac{2}{\sqrt{\kappa} X_s} ds + A_t$, where $(A_t)_t$ is constant when X_t is away from 0. The following argument yields that $(A_t)_t$ is constant equal to zero:

- The process $(X_t)_t$ is $\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^-$-Hölder continuous, as a Bessel process.
- Since $d = 3/2 > 1$, we have that $I_t = \int_0^t \frac{2}{\sqrt{\kappa} X_s} ds$ is almost surely finite, and moreover $(I_t)_t$ is $\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^-$-Hölder continuous (as can be seen from the fact that $X_t - I_t$ is a standard Brownian motion).
- By the tightness result of [KeSm12] (see [KeSm12, Theorems 3.4 and 3.12]), the driving function $(U_t)_t$ must be a.s. $\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^-$-Hölder continuous.
- As $A_t = \sqrt{\kappa} X_t + U_t - I_t$, we see that $(A_t)_t$ must be $\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^-$-Hölder continuous.
- Since $(A_t)_t$ can only vary on the set $\{t : X_t = 0\}$, whose dimension is $\frac{2-d}{2} = \frac{1}{4} < \frac{1}{2}$, A_t must be constant (as in [BDH16, Lemma 8] or [KeSm15, Section 5.4]).

This characterizes the law of the pair $(X_t, O_t)_t$, and hence the law of the driving function $(U_t)_t$: the curve λ is an $SLE_{16/3}(-2/3)$ process, with force point starting at 0^+. □

A.2. **Special points of FK interfaces.** The goal of Section A.3 will be to describe a conformally invariant exploration procedure which for any $\epsilon > 0$, with high probability as $\delta \to 0$, gives ϵ-approximations of all the level one FK loops of diameter larger than ϵ.

In order to do so, we need to control the formation of continuous cut-out domains, i.e. we need to understand what happens on the lattice level when the scaling limit of the interface has a double point or touches the boundary. We only need to control what happens on the right side of the curve γ_δ, as the arguments needed to control the left side are similar. Let us now introduce the following subsets of γ_δ (resp. γ):

- The set $\mathcal{P}_B$ of *right boundary points* is the set of points x where the interface γ_δ comes as close as possible to the counter-clockwise boundary arc from a to b, i.e. a bi-medial mesh size $\delta/2$ away (resp. γ touches the boundary arc $[a, b]$ in the continuous).
- The set $\mathcal{P}_D$ of *clockwise double points* is the set of points x where γ_δ comes within distance $\delta/2$ of a point x' of its past (resp. x is a double point of γ), and such that the interface winds clockwise from x' to x.

We call points of $\mathcal{P}_B \cup \mathcal{P}_D$ *special points*. For a special point $x \in \mathcal{P}_B \cup \mathcal{P}_D$ of γ_δ (resp. γ), we define the subpath $K(x)$ of γ_δ (resp. of γ) as follows:

- If $x \in \mathcal{P}_B$, $K(x)$ is the whole part of the curve running from the origin a to x.
- If $x \in \mathcal{P}_D$, $K(x)$ is the loop the curve forms at x, i.e. the part of the curve γ_δ (resp. γ) running from x' to x, where x' is as above.

Note that for any special points $x, y \in \mathcal{P}_B \cup \mathcal{P}_D$, if $K(x) \cap K(y) \neq \emptyset$, then either $K(x) \subseteq K(y)$ or $K(y) \subseteq K(x)$.

Given a finite family of points $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathcal{P}_B \cup \mathcal{P}_D$ containing the endpoint b, we define the partition $(P(x))_{x \in \mathcal{P}}$ of γ_δ (resp. γ) by:

$$P(x) := K(x) \setminus \bigcup_{y \in \mathcal{P} : K(y) \subset K(x)} K(y)$$

For $x \in \mathcal{P}$, we say that $P(x)$ is *an ϵ-approximation of a cut-out domain* if (at least) one of the following holds:

- The set $P(x)$ is of diameter less than 2ϵ.
- There is a cut-out domain D laying on the right side of γ_δ (resp. γ) such that $P(x)$ consists of the boundary of D, possibly together with paths of diameter less than ϵ attached to it.

We say that a finite family of special points $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathcal{P}_B \cup \mathcal{P}_D$ is an *ϵ-pinching family* if for each point $x \in \mathcal{P}$, $P(x)$ is an ϵ-approximation of a cut-out domain.



FIGURE A.1. A cut-out domain D of diameter larger than ϵ. It is bounded by pieces of γ, and clockwise double points, shown in red. Some of these double points disconnect pieces of diameter less than 2ϵ (the domain D_3 is one of these). The other (macroscopic) double points are controlled on the discrete level by purple pinching points (disconnecting D_1, D_2 and D_4). Note that in this picture the point x_2^2 is equal to x_1^2.

The main statement of this subsection is that double points of the scaling limit correspond to double points of the discrete interface (and similarly for the boundary points). More precisely, we have the following:

Proposition 15. *For all $\epsilon, \epsilon' > 0$, there is a mesh size $\delta_0 > 0$, such that for all $\delta < \delta_0$, the following holds:*

We can couple γ_δ and γ, find an ϵ-pinching family $\mathcal{P}^\epsilon$ of γ and parametrize $\gamma_\delta : [0,1] \to \Omega_\delta$ and $\gamma : [0,1] \to \bar{\Omega}$ so that, with probability at least $1 - \epsilon'$:

1. *For any special point $x \in \mathcal{P}^\epsilon$, there is a special point x_δ of γ_δ such that the subpaths $K(x_\delta)$ and $K(x)$ are parametrized by the same time intervals.*
2. *The parametrized curves γ_δ and γ are ϵ-close to each other in the topology of supremum norm.*

Proof. By Skorokhod embedding theorem, and the convergence in law of $\gamma_\delta \to \gamma$, for any sequence $\delta_n \to 0$, we can construct a coupling of γ_{δ_n} and γ such that $\gamma_{\delta_n} \to \gamma$ almost surely. Let us construct discrete $\epsilon/2$-pinching families $\mathcal{P}_\delta^\epsilon$ for all mesh sizes δ, and show that we can always extract a subsequence $(\delta_k) \subset (\delta_n)$ such that $(\gamma_{\delta_k}, \mathcal{P}_{\delta_k}^\epsilon)$ converges almost surely to $(\gamma, \mathcal{P}^\epsilon)$, where $\mathcal{P}^\epsilon$ is a finite ϵ-pinching family. This will imply the claim.

Let us now consider the finite family $(w_k(\delta) = \gamma_\delta(s_k))_{k=0,\dots,n}$ of points on γ_δ in chronological order, with

- $w_0(\delta) = a$ and $w_n(\delta) = b$
- for any $0 < i < n$, s_i is the first time after s_{i-1} when γ_δ exits the ball of radius $\epsilon/4$ around $w_{i-1}(\delta)$,
- $\operatorname{diam}(\gamma_\delta[s_{n-1}, s_n]) \leq \epsilon/4$.

We then define a finite $\epsilon/2$-pinching family $\mathcal{P}_\delta^\epsilon$ of points $x_i^j(\delta) = \gamma_\delta\left(t_i^j(\delta)\right)$ (that may not be distinct) in the following way:

- Let $x_i^0(\delta)$ be the first point of $\mathcal{P}_B \cup \mathcal{P}_D$ coming after $w_i(\delta)$ such that $K\left(x_i^0(\delta)\right)$ contains $w_i(\delta)$ and is of diameter at least $\epsilon/2$.
- For $j \geq 0$, we define $x_i^{j+1}(\delta)$ as the first point after $x_i^j(\delta)$ such that $K(x_i^j(\delta)) \subset K(x_i^{j+1}(\delta))$ and such that the diameter of $K(x_i^{j+1}(\delta)) \setminus K(x_i^j(\delta))$ is at least $\epsilon/2$.

Let us explain why $\mathcal{P}_\delta^\epsilon$ is an $\epsilon/2$-pinching family (see Figure A.1).

- Suppose y is a special point of γ_δ such that diam$K(y) \geq \epsilon/2$. Then $K(y)$ contains at least one point $w_i(\delta)$. Let j be the highest index such that $x_i^j(\delta) \in K(y)$. Then we have that either $y = x_i^j(\delta)$, or that $K(y) \setminus K(x_i^j(\delta))$ is of diameter less than $\epsilon/2$. In particular, for any special point y, we have that either $y \in \mathcal{P}_\delta^\epsilon$ or that the diameter of
$$K(y) \setminus \bigcup_{x_i^j(\delta) \in \mathcal{P}_\delta^\epsilon : K(x_i^j(\delta)) \subset K(y)} K(x_i^j(\delta))$$
is less than $\epsilon/2$.
- Every special point x of γ_δ is the closing point of a (possibly degenerate, i.e. of diameter $\delta/2$) cut-out domain D_x. Moreover, the set
$$K(x) \setminus \bigcup_{y \in \mathcal{P}_B \cup \mathcal{P}_D : K(y) \subset K(x)} K(y)$$
corresponds to the parts of γ_δ that trace the boundary of the cut-out domain D_x.
- By the two previous items, for any $x_i^j(\delta) \in \mathcal{P}_\delta^\epsilon$, we have that
$$P(x_i^j(\delta)) = D_{x_i^j(\delta)} \bigcup \left(\bigcup_{y \in \partial D_{x_i^j(\delta)} \cap (\mathcal{P}_B \cup \mathcal{P}_D \setminus \mathcal{P}_\delta^\epsilon)} \left(K(y) \setminus \bigcup_{x_k^l(\delta) \in \mathcal{P}_\delta^\epsilon \cap K(y)} K(x_k^l(\delta)) \right) \right)$$
can be obtained by attaching to $D_{x_i^j(\delta)}$ paths of diameter less than $\epsilon/2$ and hence is an $\epsilon/2$-approximation of a cut-out domain.

Note that the number of points in $\mathcal{P}_\delta^\epsilon$ is tight, as the almost sure limit γ of the γ_{δ_n} is a continuous curve. By compactness, we can assume that the family $\mathcal{P}_\delta^\epsilon$ converges to a finite family $\mathcal{P}^\epsilon$ of points $x_i^j = \gamma(t_i^j)$ on the curve γ (at least by taking a subsequence γ_{δ_k}) in the following sense: we can parametrize γ_{δ_k} and γ such that for these parametrizations $\|\gamma_{\delta_k} - \gamma\|_\infty \to 0$ almost surely, such that the limit $t_i^j := \lim t_i^j(\delta_k)$ exists for all i, j, and such that for any $x \in \mathcal{P}^\epsilon$, there exists a point $x_\delta \in \mathcal{P}_\delta^\epsilon$ such that the subpaths $K(x_\delta)$ and $K(x)$ are parametrized by the same time intervals. The claim of the proposition hence reduces to proving that the family $\mathcal{P}^\epsilon$ is an ϵ-pinching family for γ, namely that for any $x_i^j = \gamma\left(t_i^j\right) \in \mathcal{P}^\epsilon$, the set $P\left(x_i^j\right)$ is an ϵ-approximation of a cut-out domain. In the following, we will assume that $x_i^j \in \mathcal{P}_D$. The case $x_i^j \in \mathcal{P}_B$ follows from similar arguments and is simpler.

To prove this, let us first introduce approximations $x_i^j(\delta, \eta) = \gamma_\delta\left(t_i^j(\delta, \eta)\right)$ of the ϵ-pinching points $x_i^j(\delta)$ for $\eta > 0$. The point $x_i^j(\delta, \eta)$ is defined to be the first point after $x_i^{j-1}(\delta)$ (or after $w_i(\delta)$ if $j = 0$) to be *η-close to being a macroscopic pinching point*, i.e. such that if γ_δ were to continue along a (hypothetical) path $\tilde{\gamma}$ of length at most η, the pinching point $x_i^j(\delta)$ would be located at the end of $\tilde{\gamma}$.

Consider the family of points y_i^j located at times $u_i^j := \lim_{\eta_m \to 0} \lim_{\delta_k \to 0} t_i^j(\delta_k, \eta_m)$ (where the double limit $\delta_k \ll \eta_m \ll 1$ is taken through a diagonal extraction if necessary). It remains to show that with high probability, each point $y_i^j = \gamma\left(u_i^j\right)$ appears chronologically right before the point x_i^j, in the sense that diam $\left(K(x_i^j) \setminus K(y_i^j)\right) \leq \epsilon/2$. This will readily imply that $P\left(x_i^j\right)$ is an ϵ-approximation of a cut-out domain, thus concluding the proof of the proposition.

Let us now fix a point y_i^j. We want to find a quad (i.e. a topological rectangle) $\mathcal{Q}_\delta$ that contains (with high probability) FK crossings ensuring that the set $K(x_i^j) \setminus K(y_i^j)$ is small. For $\alpha > 0$, let us define the ball $B_\alpha := \left\{ z \in \Omega_\delta : \left| z - x_i^j(\delta, \eta) \right| < \alpha \right\}$ of radius α around $x_i^j(\delta, \eta)$, and let T_α be



FIGURE A.2. The quad $\mathcal{Q}_\delta$ in striped purple. Primal and dual FK crossings in this quad will force the appearance of the pinching point $x_i^j(\delta)$ before γ_δ touches the arc $[r,\ell]$.

the set of times when γ_δ visits this ball:

$$T_\alpha(\delta,\eta) := \left\{ t \in \left[0, t_i^j(\delta,\eta)\right] : \gamma_\delta(t) \in B_\alpha \right\}.$$

The curve γ does not have triple points, as this would produce a 6-arm event prevented by [CDH16, Remark 1.6]. In particular y_i^j is not a triple point for γ. As a result, we can pick $\epsilon_1 > 0$ small enough such that for all $\delta \ll \eta \ll \epsilon_1$, we have that $T_{\epsilon_1}(\delta,\eta)$ is included in two connected components of $T_{\epsilon/4}$ with high probability: one of the connected components containing $t_i^j(\delta,\eta)$, and the other one containing the end $\tilde{y}$ of the (hypothetical) curve $\tilde{\gamma}$ considered above (see Figure A.2).

Let us now define the quad $\mathcal{Q}_\delta$, with boundary marked points $r, \ell, x_i^j(\delta,\eta)$ and $\tilde{y}$ (in counterclockwise order):

- the segment $[r,\ell]$ is the connected component of $\partial B_{\epsilon_1} \setminus \gamma_\delta\left[0, t_i^j(\delta,\eta)\right] \cap \partial B_{\epsilon_1}$ that disconnects $x_i^j(\delta,\eta)$ from the endpoint b of γ_δ in the domain $\Omega_\delta \setminus \gamma_\delta\left[0, t_i^j(\delta,\eta)\right]$;
- the segments $\left[\ell, x_i^j(\delta,\eta)\right]$ and $[\tilde{y}, r]$ follow γ_δ;
- the segment $\left[x_i^j(\delta,\eta), \tilde{y}\right]$ is simply $\tilde{\gamma}$.

By choosing η small enough (and $\delta \ll \eta$), we can make the extremal distance (see [CDH16] for a definition) between the arcs $\left[\ell, x_i^j(\delta,\eta)\right]$ and $[\tilde{y}, r]$ in $\mathcal{Q}_\delta$ arbitrarily small. By the RSW estimate of [CDH16], we can ensure that with arbitrarily high probability (for any δ small enough), there is a dual FK crossing separating $\left[x_i^j(\delta,\eta), \tilde{y}\right]$ from $[r,\ell]$ and furthermore a primal FK crossing separating the dual crossing from $[r,\ell]$. As a result, there is a point $z_\ell \in \left[\ell, x_i^j(\delta,\eta)\right]$ and a point $z_r \in [\tilde{y}, r]$ between which γ_δ has to travel while staying within $\mathcal{Q}_\delta$. In particular, z_r is a special point of γ_δ such that $K(x_i^{j-1}(\delta)) \subset K(z_r)$ (resp. such that $w_i(\delta) \in K(z_r)$ if $j = 0$) and such that $K(z_r) \setminus K(x_i^{j-1}(\delta))$ encloses $\tilde{\gamma}$ and hence is of diameter larger than $\epsilon/2$. This ensures that the point $x_i^j(\delta)$ is found before the point z_r, in particular before γ_δ crosses the arc $[r,\ell]$. As y_i^j is not a triple point for the curve γ, and as the quad $\mathcal{Q}_\delta$ is of diameter less than $\epsilon/2$, we see that with high probability, $\gamma\left[t_i^j(\eta), t_i^j\right]$ is of diameter less than $\epsilon/2$ and hence with high probability the set $K(x_i^j) \setminus K(y_i^j)$ is of diameter less than $\epsilon/2$.



FIGURE A.3. In red, the first exploration path. It cuts out $k = 2$ domains with mixed boundary conditions and large diameter, as well as five domains $R_1, \dots, R_5$ with wired boundary conditions and large diameter. The mixed boundary conditions domain are further cut by two blue explorations λ^1 and λ^2. These cut out four more large domains with wired boundary conditions, and allows us to recover two FK loops: the three domains R_6, R_7, R_8 and the loop ℓ_1 for λ^1; and the domain R_9 and the loop ℓ_2 for λ^2. The purple dots are special discrete points with very high probability (as they are ϵ-pinching points).

By taking the successive limits $\delta \ll \eta \ll \epsilon_1 \ll \epsilon$, we obtain that all $P\left(x_i^j\right)$ are ϵ-approximations of a cut-out domain, and hence that $\mathcal{P}^\epsilon$ is an ϵ-pinching family, thus proving the proposition. □

A.3. **Convergence of FK loops.** In this subsection, we identify the scaling limit of the outermost FK loops by a recursive exploration procedure (see Figure A.3), analogous to the exploration procedure introduced in [CaNe07b].

Proposition 16. *The set of all level 1 FK loops in the discrete approximation Ω_δ of a Jordan domain Ω converges to a conformally invariant scaling limit.*

Proof. Let us fix $\epsilon > 0$ and define an exploration procedure (see [CaNe07b] for a similar construction) that will discover all the level one FK loops of diameter at least ϵ.

Let us choose boundary bi-medial points $a_\delta, b_\delta \in \partial\Omega_\delta^b$ converging to points $a, b \in \partial\Omega$, and consider the exploration path γ_δ from a_δ to b_δ, as in Lemma 14. Let us condition on γ_δ and consider the connected components of $\Omega_\delta \setminus \gamma_\delta$:

- The connected components on the left side of γ_δ have wired boundary conditions.
- The components on the right side of γ_δ that touch the boundary of Ω_δ have mixed boundary conditions.
- All other components stay on the right side of γ_δ and have free boundary conditions.

Let us consider the *macroscopic domains cut-out by* γ_δ, i.e. the connected components of $\Omega_\delta \setminus \gamma_\delta$ of diameter at least ϵ. With high probability there are at most N of them, for N large enough. In each of these macroscopic domain D_δ^j (for $j = 1, \dots, k \leq N$) that have mixed boundary conditions, we consider the FK interface λ_δ^j that separates the wired and the free boundary arcs. We obtain k FK loops ℓ_δ^j by concatenating each interface λ_δ^j with the arc of γ_δ joining its endpoints. Moreover,



FIGURE A.4. Double-points and contact points of FK cut-out domains cannot happen in the scaling limit, as they correspond to six-arm events. Two FK loops, in black and blue. Part of the primal configuration is drawn in green, part of the dual configuration in red. Six-arm events are marked by orange circles at four different locations. From left to right: cases (B), (A), (C), (C) of the proof of Proposition 18.

each of the λ_δ^j cuts the mixed domain into a collection of domains with free boundary conditions (these are the cut-out domains of ℓ_δ^j) and domains with wired boundary conditions.

The interface γ_δ converges to $\mathrm{SLE}_{16/3}(-2/3)$ as $\delta \to 0$ (Lemma 14). As we control special points of γ_δ (Proposition15), the domains D_δ^j converge to continuous connected components D^j of $\Omega\gamma$. Furthermore, for each j, the interface λ_δ^j converge to an $\mathrm{SLE}_{16/3}$ curve in D^j as $\delta \to 0$ ([CDHKS14, Theorem 2]). With high probability, the complement of the interior of the loop ℓ^j in the domain D^j has less than M connected component (carrying wired boundary conditions) of diameter larger than ϵ.

We have hence explored a batch of (at most N) level 1 FK loops and with high probability (with N fixed and $\delta \to 0$), the region outside of these loops contains at most $N + NM$ wired domains of diameter larger than ϵ.

Each of these domains can be further explored by iterating the exploration we used for Ω: starting with an interface between two far away points on the boundary of these new domains, and starting secondary explorations in all the resulting mixed domains of diameter larger than ϵ.

Each step of the exploration scheme reduces the maximum diameter of domains in the collection of wired domains yet to be explored (which are connected components of the set of points laying outside all FK loops currently discovered), and so, by choosing a number of step n large enough, we can ensure, with arbitrarily high probability, that after n iterations of this scheme, we are left with only domains of diameter less than ϵ.

Note that when this is the case, any level 1 FK loop that has not been found needs to stay in one of the small wired domains cut out, and so is of diameter less than ϵ. □

Remark 17. Note that the argument of Proposition 15 tells us that all double points, contact points or boundary touching points of the scaling limits of FK loops are limits of discrete double points, contact points, and boundary touching points.

A.4. **The boundary of cut-out domains are disjoint simple curves.** We conclude this appendix by a qualitative property of continuous FK loops.

Proposition 18. *The boundary of continuous cut-out domains are disjoint simple curves.*

Proof. By construction, the cut-out domains do not have 'internal' double points, i.e. double points that would disconnect their interior. Now, the presence of an 'external' double point (i.e. a point that would disconnect the interior of their complement) would imply the presence of a six-arm event (dual-dual-primal-dual-dual-primal, in cyclic order) for the FK model as in Figure A.4, case (A). In the scaling limit, this is ruled out by [CDH16, Theorem 1.5] (using the same argument as in Remark 1.6 there). Moreover, the boundaries of macroscopic cut-out domains do not touch each other by a similar argument. If there were a point of intersection, this would again imply a six-arm event (dual-dual-primal-dual-dual-primal, in cyclic order), which is again ruled out: see Figure A.4 for the two sub-cases (B) and (C) of this case. □

References

[ASW16] J. Aru, A. Sepulveda, W. Werner, On bounded-type thin local sets of the two-dimensional Gaussian free field, arXiv:1603.0336v2.

[Bef08] V. Beffara, The dimension of the SLE curve, *Ann. of Prob.* 36:1421–1452, 2008

[BDH16] S. Benoist, H. Duminil-Copin and C. Hongler, Conformal invariance of crossing probabilities for the Ising model with free boundary conditions, *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré*, to appear.

[CaNe07a] F. Camia and C.M. Newman, Critical percolation exploration path and SLE(6): a proof of convergence. *Probab. Th. Rel. Fields* 139:473-519, 2007.

[CaNe07b] F. Camia and C. M. Newman, Two-Dimensional Critical Percolation: The Full Scaling Limit. *Comm. Math. Phys.* 268(1):1–38, 2007.

[CDH16] D. Chelkak, H. Duminil-Copin and C. Hongler, Crossing probabilities in topological rectangles for the critical planar FK-Ising model. *Elec. J. Prob.* 21(5), 2016.

[CDHKS14] D. Chelkak, H. Duminil-Copin, C. Hongler, A. Kemppainen and S. Smirnov, Convergence of Ising interfaces to Schramm's SLE curves. *C.R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris*, 352(2):156–161, 2014.

[ChSm12] D. Chelkak and S. Smirnov, Universality in the 2D Ising model and conformal invariance of fermionic observables, *Invent math.* 189:515–580, *2012.*

[Gri06] G. Grimmett, *The Random-Cluster Model.* Volume 333 of Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2006.

[HoKy13] C. Hongler, K. Kytölä, Ising interfaces and free boundary conditions, *J. Am. Math. Soc.* 26:1107–1189, 2013

[Isi25] E. Ising, Beitrag zur Theorie des Ferromagnetismus. *Zeitschrift für Physik*, 31:253–258, 1925.

[Izy15] K. Izyurov, Smirnov's Observable for Free Boundary Conditions, Interfaces and Crossing Probabilities, *Comm. Math. Phys.* 337(1):225–252 , 2015.

[KeSm12] A. Kemppainen and S. Smirnov, Random curves, scaling limits and Loewner evolution, *Ann. of Prob.*, to appear.

[KeSm15] A. Kemppainen and S. Smirnov, Conformal invariance of boundary touching loops of FK Ising model, arXiv:1509.08858.

[Law05] G. F. Lawler, *Conformally Invariant Processes in the Plane.* Americ. Math. Soc, 2005.

[LSW04] G. F. Lawler, O. Schramm, W. Werner, Conformal invariance of planar loop-erased random walks and uniform spanning tree. *Ann. of Probab.* 32:939–994, 2004.

[MS16] J. Miller, S. Sheffield, CLE(4) and the Gaussian free field, in preparation.

[MSW16] J. Miller, S. Sheffield and W. Werner, CLE percolations, arXiv:1602.03884.

[PfVe99] C.-E. Pfister, Y. Velenik, Interface, surface tension and reentrant pinning 2D transition in the 2D Ising model, *Comm. Math. Phys.* 204(2):269–312, 1999.

[Sch00] O. Schramm, Scaling limits of loop-erased random walks and uniform spanning trees. *Israel J. Math.,* 118:221–288, 2000.

[ScSh09] O. Schramm and S. Sheffield, Contour lines of the two-dimensional discrete Gaussian free field*, Acta Math.,* 202(1):21–137, 2009.

[ScWi05] O. Schramm, D. B. Wilson, SLE coordinate changes, *New York J. Math*, 11:659–669, 2005.

[She09] S. Sheffield, Exploration trees and conformal loop ensembles. *Duke Math. J.*, 147(1):79–129, 2009.

[ShWe12] S. Sheffield and W. Werner, Conformal loop ensembles: the Markovian characterization and the loop-soup construction. *Ann. of Math.* (2), 176(3):1827–1917, 2012.

[Smi01] S. Smirnov, Critical percolation in the plane: conformal invariance. Cardy's formula, scaling limits, *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.,* 333, 3:239–244, 2001.

[Smi06] S. Smirnov, Towards conformal invariance of 2D lattice models. *Sanz-Solé, Marta (ed.) et al., Proceedings of the international congress of mathematicians (ICM), Madrid, Spain, August 22–30, 2006. Volume II: Invited lectures, 1421-1451. Zürich: European Mathematical Society (EMS),* 2006.

[Smi10a] S. Smirnov, Conformal invariance in random cluster models. I. Holomorphic fermions in the Ising model. *Annals of Math.* 172(2):1435–1467, 2010.

Department of Mathematics, Columbia University. 2990 Broadway, New York, NY 10027, USA.
E-mail address: sbenoist@math.columbia.edu

Chair of Statistical Field Theory, MATHAA Institute, Ecole Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne, Station 8, 1015 Lausanne, Switzerland.
E-mail address: clement.hongler@epfl.ch